

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 8-11, with all other claims being canceled.

The Examiner rejected Claims 16-18, 24, 38-40, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuroda et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,915,434). This rejection is respectfully traversed, but moot in view of the canceled claims. Applicant maintains the position that Kuroda does not contain any disclosure or suggestion of a cryptographic communication method in which a received signal is detected to be a particular type of signal, such as a unicast signal or a multicast signal. Nor does Kuroda contain any disclosure or suggestion of selecting different types of cryptographic keys dependent on whether the received signal is detected to be a unicast signal or a multicast signal.

The Examiner rejected Claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wright et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,084,969). This rejection is respectfully traversed but also moot in view of the canceled claim. Again, Wright does not contain any disclosure of generating, in situ, the cryptographic keys at both the sender and the receiver end of a transmission.

The Examiner rejected Claims 17 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda in view of Jones (U.S. patent no. 5,412,730). This rejection is respectfully traversed but moot in view of the canceled claims. Again, Jones fails to make up the deficiencies of Kuroda. Rather, Jones is simply directed to a encryption system in which transmitter and receiver both have pseudo-random generators for generating symmetrical encryption keys. Even when combined, the references do not teach or suggest the invention recited by dependent Claims 17 and 39.

Despite the above, Applicant is canceling all of the claims that were rejected and intend to further prosecute the rejected claims in a continuation application; accordingly, the claims are canceled without prejudice. Meanwhile, since all of the pending claims have been indicated as allowable by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully request an early allowance of the case.

An amendment after final is respectfully requested to be entered, as the amendments are simply cancellation of the rejected claims and do not present any new issues.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Assistant Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 578062000100. However, the Assistant Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: July 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
David T. Yang

Registration No.: 44,415  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
555 W. Fifth Street, Suite 3500  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
(213) 892-5587  
Attorneys for Applicant